



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XII

JANUARY, 1919

NUMBER 1

THE EFFECT OF THE WAR ON PROTESTANT MISSIONS

JAMES L. BARTON

BOSTON

One would be indeed presumptuous to predict the effect of this war upon foreign missionary operations. Indeed, to report fully the present effect of this world war upon the work of the various foreign missionary societies of the world is an impossible task. Missionary leaders are, however, attempting to estimate the significance of the present bearing of war conditions, while few would be so bold as to suggest even what the future may be.

That foreign missionaries and their operations are seriously and fundamentally affected all will agree. It could hardly be otherwise when nearly every country in which foreign missionaries and their institutions are located is under the flag of one of the belligerent powers, and much mission territory is actually within the zone of war or of active military preparations. Within the war zone are the mission fields of the Balkan Peninsula, all of the Turkish Empire, Syria, Arabia, Egypt, Persia, all of the former German colonies in Africa, and the islands of the Pacific held by Germany at the outbreak of the war, while North Africa, Ceylon, India, Burmah, Siam, British South Africa, and Portuguese East and West Africa are upon the borderland of war or of direct

preparation for war. Beyond these areas all that remains of Africa, all of China, Japan, extensive sections of South America, and the Philippine Islands, as well as other lesser territories, are under a flag of one of the Allies and so are within the war field and subject to special war regulations. We can mention here but few of the conditions which have especially confronted foreign missionary enterprises during the last four years, some of which have been fundamental to future work, while others are only incidental and will quickly pass when war conditions cease.

I. EXTERNAL CONDITIONS

The first missionary areas to be seriously disturbed were the four German colonies in Africa and the German possessions in the Pacific Islands. These colonies and the Islands were the field of Protestant missionary operations, largely of British, American, and German missionaries. The Allies at once made attack upon these colonies and, in practically every instance, the missionary areas were invaded and the mission stations were occupied by one party or the other and made the base of military activities. Great hardship was suffered by some of the missionaries, especially the British, when invaded by the Germans, although the German missionaries make fully as strong complaint against their treatment at the hands of British and French invaders. The German missions were more depleted since German missionaries of military age were called upon to join the fighting forces and, in some fields, nearly the entire German male missionary body was transferred to the ranks and the mission work was left without much male supervision. The native Christians too were seriously involved. A British war vessel visited a station of one of the American Mission Boards with direction to take on board the

American missionaries. After due deliberation the missionaries replied, that as they were at the place of duty and opportunity, they had unanimously decided to remain in spite of the friendly offer of the Admiral to carry them to a place of safety. The Admiral removed his hat and replied, "Many a man today wears the Victoria Cross for acts of heroism far less worthy than that which you exhibit." While the missionaries suffered necessarily many hardships, no violent deaths have been reported, and after the colonies had been entirely overcome by the Allies, the work settled down to more normal conditions.

In the Balkan Peninsula, an area fought over since 1912 more than any other section of the world, mission work has been very little disturbed. There are mission stations in the Balkan Peninsula that have been under four different flags in the last six years. Monastir, for instance, was under the Turkish flag in 1912. This flag was replaced by the Bulgarian in the first Balkan war and that by the Serbian flag in the second Balkan war in 1913 and now by the French flag. None of the parties taking possession of the country have materially interfered with missionary work. The Bulgarian government was wholly friendly. The Serbian government was somewhat suspicious but not hostile.

Turkey has differed from all others connected with the war because it has experienced atrocities such as the world has seldom before witnessed, while at the same time it has been the field of military operations of the first order. The war has raged in the west about the Dardanelles, in the southeast in Syria and Mesopotamia, and in the northeast along the Russian and Persian border. From twenty-five to thirty per cent of the missionaries who were there at the outbreak of the war have remained. About five per cent of those who remained have died during this war period, most of them

from typhus, typhoid, and cholera. The character of the work was materially changed owing to the unprecedented conditions.

The Persian situation has differed little from the Turkish except that Persia has been outside of the real war zone, although the northern section of the country has been fought over by Russian, Turkish, and Allied troops and there have been many local disturbances which have at times threatened the life of the missionaries. Irresponsible mobs have taken possession of some mission stations, as at Tabriz, where the Presbyterian Hospital was sacked together with the American Consulate.

The missionary enterprise throughout the world has suffered seriously from the loss of man-power. Many missionaries, recognizing as paramount the call of their country, have withdrawn temporarily from missionary service and taken up some form of war work. Some of the Mission Boards in Great Britain and Canada have lost in this way more than fifty per cent of their male missionaries of war age. So far as reported, the American missionary societies have not lost that number, but the Mission Boards have taken the position that they would throw no obstacle in the way of any missionary who wished to enter military service. The number of new appointees has necessarily been reduced. From twenty to thirty is the age when most missionaries are appointed, and, while theological students and ordained men are exempt from the draft, there were many who did not wish to claim this exemption. Many Mission Boards are sending out for educational, industrial, and medical work men who are not ordained and who thus would not be exempt. It is an interesting fact that some of these missionaries have been given their release from military service on the ground that the service they contemplated rendering in the mission field was calculated to aid

materially in winning the war. There have been many interesting cases of this character, showing the breadth of the Exemption Boards in their recognition of the work of the foreign missionaries as international agencies working in the interests of international brotherhood and good understanding.

The German missions have probably suffered more from a loss of man-power than any others, because a larger percentage of their missionaries were bound by military regulations to take their place in the ranks whenever their country called for their services. It has already been stated that in the German colonies in Africa a large number of the German missionaries joined the military forces. This was true of many who were at home on furlough and of others who were deported from their mission fields early in the war. At the same time, it was impossible for the Mission Boards in Germany to communicate with their mission fields, so that missionaries even past the military age who were caught at their home-base could not return and, in fact, their return was forbidden in all cases where their mission territory came under the flag of a country at war with Germany. The effect therefore of the war upon the man-power and support of German missions has been disastrous. This condition has attracted the attention of the British and American missionary societies, and considerable sums of money have been raised, both in Great Britain and the United States, to conserve the German work, and the Government of India has been most liberal in its treatment of these missions.

The financial loss of the missions has been great, caused by the increased cost of nearly all commodities everywhere. No part of the world is free from the apparently universal advance in the price of foodstuffs, labor, and of wearing apparel. This has compelled the increase of the annual allowance for the support of missionaries.

At the same time, the cost of transportation, both of the missionary and his supplies, has more than doubled, and to this is to be added the increase of cost of exchange, brought about chiefly by the rise in the price of silver. As an illustration, the year before the war exchange in China went as high as \$2.15 in silver for one dollar gold. Since the war began the price has been falling rapidly so that it has reached, according to latest reports, the unprecedented figure of a little better than one dollar silver for one dollar gold. As all payments in China are made in silver, this item alone has nearly doubled the expenditure of missionary funds in that country in order to maintain the work upon its former basis.

The movement of missionaries has been severely hampered by war conditions. Necessarily the Government has been compelled to put new and stringent restrictions upon the issuing of passports since the passport privilege has been abused by representatives of the Central Powers. In addition to this, Great Britain, because of her disastrous experience with German missionaries, put restrictions upon the entrance of missionaries from countries other than Great Britain into British possessions. For instance, if a Mission Board wishes to send a missionary into India, whether he is a new appointee or a veteran returning to his field of labor, application for permission must be made through the British Embassy at Washington. This application properly vouched for is sent to India through England and, after investigation in India as well as in the United States, if nothing appears against the candidate, permission for going to India is granted. A passport cannot be secured from the United States government until this permission is obtained. This has caused much delay and has also excluded from British colonies many missionaries of German descent. Other difficulties have appeared in the form of limited facilities for travel. Steamship lines

have been reduced in number, until it has become almost impossible to secure passage for a missionary or missionary family to cross either the Atlantic or the Pacific without waiting for several months. The northern Atlantic has been closed to missionary travel, but the southern Atlantic still remains open, while there have been no restrictions upon the Pacific except such as are caused by lack of passenger service.

II. THE EFFECT OF THE WAR ON MISSION WORK IN TURKEY AND PERSIA

The most striking illustration of the effect of the war upon mission work in Turkey will be discussed under the head of "The Effect of the War on the Mohammedan World." At the outbreak of the war Turkey was occupied as a mission field principally by the Presbyterian Board of Missions, carrying on extensive work in Syria and Palestine, and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, conducting work across Asia Minor, through Armenia and Kurdistan and down into northern Syria. This work was established about a century ago, and out of it had grown not only a large number of churches but an extensive medical work and educational institutions of national and international repute. When missionaries entered the country there was not a vestige of modern education to be found throughout the land. It was inevitable that men and women trained in our best American colleges and universities should there lay the foundation for a thorough education for all classes. The Armenians were the first to respond, followed by the Bulgarians of the western part of the country and of Macedonia, and then the Greeks, the Mohammedans coming last. Besides the large number of hospitals under American missionary physicians of the highest standing, there have grown up

a long list of notable colleges, like the Syrian Protestant College at Beirût, Euphrates College at Harpût, Robert College at Constantinople, the American College for Girls at Constantinople, the International College at Smyrna, Anatolia College at Marsovan, Aintab College at Aintab, St. Paul's Institute at Tarsus, Central Turkey College for Girls at Marash, and last and perhaps least the American College at Van, just beginning its career as a college at the beginning of the war. In addition to these colleges were several times their number of preparatory schools and academies, much more widely distributed throughout the country. At the outbreak of the war, in these higher intermediate and primary schools in Turkey, directly under the control and direction of Americans, most of whom were missionaries, there were nearly thirty thousand of the best and brightest young men and women of Turkey receiving a modern education.

There was some work carried on by British societies in Mesopotamia and in the vicinity of Constantinople, and German missionaries, for some fifteen years previous to the outbreak of the war, had been carrying on limited missionary operations. The Germans had been strengthening their missions continuously during the entire period, they having begun there after the massacres of Armenians in 1895-6 and the friendly alliance created by the visit of the Kaiser to Abdul Hamid in 1898. All this work had been established under what are known in the diplomatic world as concessions and capitulations. Turkey was loath to make treaties with western Powers, it being contrary to the dignity and rights of the Caliph of Islam, the Sultan of Turkey, thus to bind himself. Concessions were made which theoretically, at least upon the part of the Sultan, might be abrogated at will. Under these concessions foreigners were allowed to come into the country, missionary work was especially recog-

nized, and more or less foreign business had been built up between Turkey and the western nations. Missionary, medical, educational, and charitable institutions which had been founded during the last sixty years, had been established under privileges granted by these concessions and capitulations.

Within a month after the war began and before Turkey had actually joined the belligerents, the capitulations were abrogated by an official proclamation which diplomatically and legally left no standing whatever for any foreign institution within Turkey. There were no laws and no treaties by which foreign property and foreigners themselves could claim protection. The proclamation of abrogation demanded that all foreigners and all foreign property should come at once under Turkish law, and that foreigners should have no right of appeal to their consuls or ambassadors. If these conditions had been immediately and strictly carried out, it would have caused the destruction of all missionary work. The American ambassador, joining with all of the other ambassadors in Turkey, including the German, made strenuous protest against such a step on the part of Turkey, claiming, as they had a right to claim, that the capitulations and concessions were virtually treaties and that they could not be abrogated without the consent of all parties concerned. The decree of abrogation was not carried out in all details. Missionaries did appeal to their consuls and to their ambassadors. While local officials in some of the interior stations overstepped their rights, breaking the seal of American consuls and taking possession of American schools, the central Government gradually yielded to the arguments of the ambassadors and issued a series of regulations which were afterward materially modified, so that missionary work was not vitally interfered with. Much credit is due to Ambassador Morgenthau for his strenuous and effective protest

with the Turkish officials against any such drastic treatment of American interests in Turkey. At the time the order of abrogation was issued there were from eight to ten million dollars' worth of property in Turkey owned by American missionaries and American educational institutions. This was in the form of educational, medical, printing, industrial, and religious plants with their buildings and equipment, including the residences of Americans engaged in the conduct of the different forms of work. Back of these plants there was a total of investment of not less than forty millions of dollars covering nearly a century of endeavor in the country.

Attention was very soon turned from controversy over the abolition of the capitulations to the atrocities which Turkey, under the leadership of Germany, began to perpetrate, first against the Armenians and later upon Syrians and Greeks. This attack upon the Armenians, who comprised the larger part of the student and teaching force and working Christian body in Asiatic Turkey, struck a direct blow at the educational and missionary work. Native professors in American colleges, teachers, pastors, leaders, and students in the educational institutions were seized by the thousands, some of them horribly tortured, many put to death, while others were sent into exile down into Syria and northern Arabia. The story of these atrocities is too well known to require repetition here. The effect upon educational work in the interior of Turkey was paralyzing, as in the College at Aintab, Euphrates College at Harpût, and the College at Van. Nearly every Armenian teacher was at once eliminated and the older students either taken into the army, exiled, or killed.

The missionaries remained on the ground and used their influence as far as they were able to counteract the disastrous effect of this atrocious attack. They were recognized as the defenders of the Christian populations

against the Government measure of extermination. Relief funds were furnished them from the American Committee for Armenian and Syrian Relief in the United States, and from that time to this large numbers of them have given a greater part of their time and strength to the carrying out of measures of relief, by the aid of over \$5,000,000 of funds provided from America.

After the first attack against American institutions and their native constituencies, a constantly increasing number of Mohammedan officials seemed to begin to realize something of the heinousness of their acts and so consequently to withdraw their opposition. They began to afford the missionaries a measure of coöperation; for instance, the Syrian Protestant College at Beirût received much help from Djemal Pasha, a former member of the Young Turk Cabinet and later commander of the Fourth Turkish Army Corps that was operating against Egypt and the Allied forces in Syria. Through him, in the face of difficult food conditions, supplies were secured and the College was able to carry on its work with a larger number of students than it has had before in its history. This increase of students was partly due to the closing of British and French schools at Beirût, and also to the feeling on the part of many parents that the safest place for their children was in the American school. This same condition prevailed also in Constantinople, and Robert College and the American College for Girls have been overwhelmed with students in spite of the increased cost of living. According to latest reports Robert College had more than fifty per cent increase in its student body, as did the American College for Girls, and Talaat Pasha, then Grand Vizier, was giving much assistance in obtaining fuel and food. The International College in Smyrna, although its president is a British subject, has continued its work uninterruptedly. It has been compelled to

reduce the number of students it could accept owing to its shortened teaching force and limited finances, but the president reports this last year to be one of the most encouraging and promising in the history of the College. Institutions in the interior have not fared so well. Anatolia College at Marsovan lost most of its faculty and its student body. Only the Greeks remained after the first onslaught on the College. Nearly a year before the breaking of diplomatic relations between Turkey and the United States the entire missionary force at Marsovan was removed by the government under military order, but later four members of the station were allowed to return and the work for girls was resumed, but the boys' college has remained closed. Euphrates College at Harpût remained open, although no work of college grade was carried on after the first attack. This work was suspended when diplomatic relations were broken with the United States.

It has been impossible for the last two years to send out of the country any detailed reports of the progress of the work, but between one and two hundred Americans, missionaries and teachers and physicians, have remained in the country, continuing the educational and medical work as far as possible but devoting themselves primarily to acting as agents for reaching with measures of relief the starving, stricken, exiled peoples of that country. These have remained in spite of the urgent demand of Ambassador Elkus, at the time when diplomatic relations with the United States were broken, that they all should withdraw from the country. The State Department even demanded that all Americans should come out, but this large company of men and women, in spite of the possibility that the United States might soon be at war with Turkey, decided to stay where, they declared, they believed they could render the largest service to humanity and the world. They were conscious

of the fact that should they withdraw, these suffering scores of thousands of people would be left without aid and at the mercy of any one who wished to attack them.

Many have died during this war period, of disease incident to the country. Of the missionaries of the American Board alone seven have died of typhus, and possibly eight. The death of seven others who were not physically strong was undoubtedly hastened by the severe strain upon them. One, Mrs. G. C. Raynolds, died through an accident incurred on the flight of the missionaries from Van preceding its re-capture by the Turks. Two suffered probably a violent death, although the case of Mr. George P. Knapp, a graduate of Harvard University in the class of 1887, might have been a case of typhus. The truth will undoubtedly remain a secret. Two Presbyterian missionaries in Syria died, one of typhus and the other of cholera.

In Persia the situation has been somewhat similar to that in Turkey, although Persia has not been within the actual western war zone. Its northern territory has been overrun by both Turkish and Russian troops, and the Kurdish element got out of control and added to the terror of the situation. Six of the Persian Presbyterian missionaries died of typhus and cholera, but most of them are there on the ground today, administering relief as far as they are able to the starving population of more than one million souls. In both Turkey and Persia the fact that missionaries have remained at their posts of service in the midst of peril from disease and in many cases from violence, when it was fully known to the authorities and to the Mohammedan populations that they not only had the privilege of withdrawing to their homeland but were even ordered by their government to do so, has had a mighty influence on the thinking of the Mohammedans. This example of missionary

heroism and devotion, never surpassed in the history of Christian missions, is leading to most serious thought on the part of Moslems. They recognize in this act a vast difference between Islam and Christianity, and while they may reject the preaching of the missionaries and declare impracticable many of the demands of the gospel of Christ, they cannot deny the fact that these Christian missionaries coming to their country in the name of the Christ have exhibited Him with mighty power in the lives of sacrifice and peril they have lived and in the heroic deaths they have died. Through these conditions a message of surpassing power and influence has been delivered and is still being delivered to the Moslem populations of these two great Mohammedan countries.

III. THE EFFECT OF THE WAR ON THE MOHAMMEDAN WORLD

There is reason for referring to Mohammedanism as the "Mohammedan world," although followers of Mohammed are widely scattered among many different peoples, speaking various tongues and occupying but a mere fragment of the world's surface under Mohammedan governments. Nevertheless, the unity that has prevailed among Mohammedans in creed, practice, ideals, and expectations, no matter what their language or nationality, has given ground at least for the expression. Also the Mohammedans have presented an organized, unified resistance to the Christian approach to such an extent that it has seemed like the resistance of a single body united with one purpose. This resistance has been so persistent that the Christian approach to the Mohammedans has made but little general progress in the past and the Christianization of the Mohammedans has been almost the despair of missionary organizations. Moham-

medanism, in extending itself among pagan peoples, as in Africa, and in propagating its faith among the non-Moslem populations among which Mohammedans have dwelt, has made much use of the argument that Mohammedanism is a unit, undivided, with a single ideal and purpose, more unified than any other religion and ultimately bound through its unity of creed and effort to win the entire world.

This was the state of affairs at the outbreak of the war, and it was a condition that Germany made deep plans to use in prosecuting the war. There is evidence to show that it was Germany's purpose to fire the Mohammedan world with a mighty *jihad* that would paralyze civilization. The well-known effort inaugurated through the Sheik-ul-Islam and the Sultan of Turkey acting as the Caliph of Islam, has passed into history. Its failure was a surprise to the entire world, bringing consternation to Germany. The alliance of Turkey with so-called Christian Germany and Austria has estranged Turkey, as the only existing Mohammedan government of recognized significance, from the other great national bodies of Islam. India, Egypt, the North African states, and other Mohammedan countries, repudiated the alliance and refused to join in a holy war under Turkey's leadership. The result has been the dismemberment of Mohammedanism as a centralized religious force. Never since the day of Mohammed has the Mohammedan world been so disrupted, disorganized, and destitute of religious leadership. After the shock of the refusal of the Mohammedans to respond to the call for a holy war, the next great cleavage thrust into the very centre of Mohammedanism was the disaffection of the Arabian tribes, their repudiation of Turkey and their affiliation with the Allies. The chief significance of the separation of Arabia from Turkey lies in the fact that the sacred places of Islam—Mecca and Medina—are located in

Arabia, and the Sultan of Turkey for centuries has been recognized as the keeper and protector of these sacred shrines.

As the direct result of this endeavor of Turkey under German leadership to precipitate a holy war, we find that Mohammedanism has lost its Caliph and is now without an accepted religious head. The Mohammedans of India, Egypt, and, in fact, nearly all parts of the world, have either tacitly or officially repudiated the Sultan of Turkey as the Caliph of Islam, a position which he has held for four centuries or more. This leaves Mohammedans without a recognized leader, while the Mohammedans of India and Egypt have declared their loyalty to Great Britain, thus breaking the centralized political power of Mohammedanism, in addition to its disrupted religious solidarity.

Arabia, under the leadership of the Sherif of Mecca, has officially and religiously rejected the Sultan as the Caliph and has assumed absolute control of the sacred shrines of Islam. The Sherif has set himself up as the King of the Hedjaz and the legitimate and proper protector of Mecca and Medina. In his proclamation to the Mohammedan world he severely condemns the Sultan of Turkey as the Caliph of Islam for the action taken in calling a holy war in conjunction with Germany. To the present time no Mohammedan country or Mohammedan leader has come forward as the defender of the Sultan or his claim upon the Caliphate.

There is no agreement among the Mohammedans upon a Caliph. The law of Mohammedanism would seem to demand that the Caliph shall be the ruler of an independent Mohammedan country, as he is supposed to be not only the religious but the political head of his people. At the present time the only ruler of what may be called an independent Mohammedan kingdom is the Sherif of Mecca, self-proclaimed as the King of the Hedjaz, two

small provinces in Arabia upon the Red Sea but in which are located Mecca and Medina. Whether or not the Mohammedans will recognize the King of the Hedjaz as the Caliph remains to be seen, but apart from him there seems to be no available candidate.

Thus it is apparent that the organic religious and political unity of the Mohammedan world has been shattered, so that no longer can Moslems present a united front in opposition to Christianity or of any other religion, nor can they exercise political power for intimidating Mohammedans who are inclined to turn away from their ancestral faith and consider the contents and claims of Christianity. Already there are indications of a new sense of liberty and freedom in some countries, which is but a part of the movement so prevalent in the world today from autocracy toward democracy. It indicates a desire and a purpose on the part of many Mohammedans at least to exercise their own judgment and to demand liberty of action in religious matters.

This state of affairs would seem to open the door of approach for the Christian teacher and preacher more favorably than it has ever been open since the days of Mohammed. Mohammedans are beginning to realize that their solidarity is broken, that their hope of universal Mohammedan rule over the world is shattered forever. Intelligent Mohammedans are recognizing the fact that Mohammedanism does not contain those elements of strength which furnish an adequate religious motive and ideal for any society, much less for a State. This has brought to them a sense of discouragement and in many places almost of despair for the future of their faith. There are many indications that large groups of Mohammedans are ready to inquire sincerely and earnestly into the principles of Christianity and what it promises to its followers. There has never been a time since Christianity came into open conflict with Islam when conditions

seemed so favorable for a wise, judicious, united approach to the Mohammedan world with the message of Christianity. There are no people who need more the gospel of sanitation, of industry, of brotherhood, of intelligence, of sacrifice, and of consecration than do the Mohammedans. The task is a colossal one, involving the approach to fully one-seventh of this world's population, dwelling largely within or near the tropics, prejudiced and fanatical. It is too great for any one communion to undertake; it is too important to be undertaken by all communions acting separately. There are many who feel and believe that through this war and its effect upon Mohammedanism as well as upon Christianity at home, the time has come for a united effort on the part of the Christian world to approach the Mohammedan world in a way that will win their confidence and gradually their coöperation and ultimately their allegiance. The most fundamental effect of this war upon the non-Christian world is that of its influence upon Mohammedanism, constituting a new challenge to the Christian Church.

IV. THE EFFECT OF THE WAR UPON THE GERMAN ATTITUDE TOWARDS MOHAMMEDANISM

In German colonies in Africa at the outbreak of the war there were less than two million Mohammedans. Apart from these colonies German territory had practically no Mohammedan population. The Christians of Germany were deeply interested in Mohammedan problems and in missionary endeavor to reach the people of that faith. In 1910 a German Colonial Congress was held in Hamburg in which the Moslem peril in East Africa was seriously discussed. After the discussion the Congress adopted the following resolution:

“Since the progress of Islam in our colonies is accompanied by grave perils, this Colonial Congress recommends a thorough study

EFFECT OF THE WAR ON PROTESTANT MISSIONS 19

of Moslem propagandism. The Congress is thoroughly convinced that everything which favors the progress of Islam and hinders the progress of Christianity should be avoided, and especially commends the cultural efforts of missionary education and hospital work to the support of the Colonial Government. We also recognize in the Moslem peril an urgent challenge to German Christianity to occupy the regions threatened by Islam with missionary effort."

It is an interesting fact that in this conference there were Protestants, Roman Catholics, and Socialistic leaders. The clear-cut utterance of the resolution above quoted does not tally well with the fact that for the last twenty years the Kaiser has made no utterance, so far as records show, that would in any way offend the most fanatical Mohammedan. When the war began it was evident that Germany was putting much reliance upon her relations with Turkey as *the* central Mohammedan power. The German Government went so far as to plan with Turkey for calling a holy war. Germany placed much dependence upon the uprising of the two hundred and thirty millions of Mohammedans in a real alliance with Germany, thus striking a fatal blow at Great Britain, France, Italy, and Russia, each of whom had large Mohammedan populations under its flag. England alone ruled over ninety-one millions of Mohammedans, of which sixty-seven millions were in India.

Soon after the alliance between Germany and Turkey was established, Christian leaders in Germany began to show a different attitude toward Mohammedanism, as for instance, Professor Friedrich Delitzsch of Berlin; who, as early as the spring of 1915, in an address to a Berlin audience said:

"Islam, so far from being a barren and retrogressive faith, leaves the door wide open to religious, moral, and social progress, and therefore no German Christian need be ashamed of an alliance which, begun in time of war, will be cemented and bear worthy fruit in times of peace."

In a lecture delivered in the spring of the same year, Professor Wilhelm Hermann of Marburg said:

"We must be convinced that they [the Turks] understand us and we them. Were this not the case, our alliance would be a false and unworthy one. As Christians we can understand and reverence their religious convictions, and our future lies along the same road as theirs."

After discussing the alliance of Germany with Islam, at about the same period Professor Troeltsch said:

"Islam is thereby recognized as one of the great acknowledged religious world powers which can no longer be a missionary objective, but must be left, just as in the Christian world, to its own inner religious development. It is unlikely that this result will ever be reversed, and it will affect the treatment of the Moslem problem in our Colonial possessions. For all that, Christianity is of course not invalidated in the territories occupied by the white race, to which, apart from the Christian communities in our colonies, it seems bound to confine itself, though it is limited as regards its world mission. It seems to be conclusively established that humanity is distributed into distinct spheres of religious life, free henceforth to stimulate one another religiously but each bound to fulfil its own destiny. This will astonish or alarm no one who has already come to this conviction on general principles from a study of the history of religion, but it is now beginning to be universally evident from the course of historical events."

These quotations are sufficient to show the trend of thought among many of the religious leaders, but they do not represent the sentiment of all the Christian people of Germany. *Missions-Magazin*, of which Herr F. Würz is editor, took up the discussion, maintaining strongly that the German Government could make no alliance with a religion, and that the Christian people of Germany, in order to maintain loyalty to their country, were not to assume that Mohammedans do not need Christianity. In the midst of this discussion Herr Würz says:

"Our own share in the gospel of Christ may well be at stake, if, in the political alliance with the Mohammedan world, we lightly

esteem the incomparable treasure with which we have been endowed by God. That would mean, not the end of the world mission of Christianity, but certainly the end of our world mission on behalf of Christianity. It may be difficult for us when, as a natural consequence of political alliance, the consensus of public opinion is friendly toward Islam, to maintain our clear Christian consciousness with regard to that faith. But if we do, we may bring blessing to the Mohammedan world with which we are now outwardly so closely associated."

Professor Julius Richter of Berlin, editor of the *Allgemeine Missions Zeitschrift*, takes up the discussion, but not with the same clearness and emphasis as Herr Würz. In 1915 there was an assembly of the German Evangelical Missionary Committee to discuss this important question. Every German Evangelical Missionary Society was represented. Bishop Hennig, a member of the Continuation Committee of the Edinburgh Missionary Conference, presided. One of the most important questions discussed was, "What Missions may do in order to protect the home Churches from a wrong valuation of Islam." So far as is known, no resolutions were passed; but in reporting this Conference in the *Evangelisches Missions-Magazin* of June, 1916, Herr Schlunk of Hamburg, among other things, said:

"Wide circles of the German people not only stand in actual danger of placing an incorrect valuation upon the religion of Mohammed but they have already fundamentally fallen prey to this danger. Through a determined admiration of Islam they become equally determined to forget their own Christian position and believe that they are in this way fulfilling their obligation to the German cause. If one demands, however, that the Ottoman kingdom should be absolutely excluded from the sphere of missions, he seeks thereby to cut the vital nerve of all missionary work and to bring into question the essential superiority of Christianity to the non-Christian religions."

This question is still under discussion in Germany, but not so prominently as in the first year of the war. It

will remain to be seen whether, when the war is over, the Christians of Germany will have reached the conclusion that the Mohammedan world is outside of the sphere of their missionary activity. It is not improbable also that Great Britain may feel herself to be under special obligations to Mohammedans and to such a degree that there will be a tendency to put restriction upon missionary work among and for Mohammedans under the British flag. The fact that she rules over such a vast Mohammedan population and that the Mohammedans exert such a dominant influence, especially in India and Egypt, will undoubtedly lead many statesmen of Great Britain to raise the question as to whether Christian missionaries should not be excluded from undertaking any direct religious work for Mohammedans in these countries at least, if not in all other countries where Mohammedans are found in any considerable number. Such an attitude can be taken only under the mistaken supposition that Christian missionaries are a disturbing element when working among Moslems. Missionary Societies and Boards are eagerly watching the trend of events as they affect the relations of Moslems to the great missionary movement.

V. ENLARGED VISION OF MISSIONS IN RELATION TO THE STATE

The war is having a marked effect not only upon the administrative officers and missionaries of foreign mission organizations but also upon the constituency at large, by way of giving them all a new conception of the place of foreign missions in establishing, throughout Asia and in Africa, a civilization in harmony with the twentieth-century Christian ideals. The old conception that the foreign missionary went out to teach pagan peoples a creed in order to save them from the wrath to come, had

already become enlarged, during the last generation of missionary endeavor, to a more balanced conception of the sociological value of Christianity. Christian missionaries have been for the last two decades attempting scientifically to apply the principles of the gospel of Christ and the teachings of the New Testament to the society of the East, and this effort has not been without a large degree of success. The war, however, has brought to the front a new and enlarged phase of the missionary enterprise hardly dreamed of before, but now becoming important in the light of present-day questions. The missionaries and missionary administrators are recognizing that the gospel is not simply for the individual and for society, but that it is a gospel suited to the needs of the State. We are learning the same lessons also in the West. The principles that lie at the foundation of the most stupendous alliance of nations the world has ever seen are the principles taught in the New Testament. These are justice and righteousness in national administration, the right of the individual and of the small nation to live and to enjoy a large degree of liberty without fear or favor, the principle that the stronger nations are under God the natural protectors of the weaker nations. These principles are now at the front in the discussion of war questions and especially of questions looking to a permanent peace yet to be established. The discussion has already passed beyond that of the value of the principles of the gospel in the organization and conduct of the affairs of a nation, to international relations where nation deals with nation, so affecting the permanent peace of the world. This conception of international Christianity was perhaps thrust for the first time into diplomatic circles by our own Secretary, John Hay, when the great powers of Europe set about to partition China. He in the name of the United States Government protested against such partitioning. This protest

raised a storm of opposition among his fellow diplomats, on the ground that diplomacy as between nations must remain always and forever purely selfish. The statement was made that if the United States wished a portion of China, she should put in her claim and defend it, but if she did not, she had no right to lift her voice in the interests of the integrity of China for China's sake. It was maintained that such an attitude was unknown in international diplomacy. Secretary Hay held his position and saved China from dismemberment. The principle, however, did not seem to reach the inner consciousness of the national life of the world until the outbreak of the present war. The last two years have revealed a marvellous advance in the thinking of the civilized world upon the sisterhood of nations. The world is rapidly learning that when one nation suffers all suffer, that when one is prosperous all are prosperous in a proportionate degree. We are learning that no nation or country on earth can remain backward intellectually, morally, or nationally, and not to a degree become a dead weight and even a menace to the other nations of the world. This at once brings the whole subject up to the very door of the foreign missionary enterprise.

There are two illustrations now prominently before the world which may be given as concrete examples of the point under consideration.

A few years ago China, the oldest autocracy on the face of the earth, with enormous although undeveloped wealth at her disposal, and with a population twice in excess of that of any other nation, decided to throw off her autocracy, depose her Emperor, and establish a constitutional government. This decision was not made hastily, but followed extended discussions and long deliberation. When the decision was reached it seemed to carry with it practically the entire population of that great empire, and China quietly and unostentatiously

swung out from the number of hereditary monarchies into the circle of democracies. A constitution was adopted, a President was elected by the people, parliament assembled, laws were made for the government of the new republic, and all without any untoward disturbance. It is true there were riots in some parts of the empire, as there have always been since China has been known to the Western world, but no more. Foreign relations were not disturbed, foreign commerce was not interfered with, foreigners dwelling in the country did not regard their lives in peril or their property in jeopardy. For half a dozen years China has moved forward under a democratic form of government and only recently has elected a new President, without disturbance and apparently to the entire satisfaction of all of the people. As the great war developed, China, believing in democracy as the form of government best suited to her particular genius, joined the Allies, and at once became a force in winning this war for world justice, righteousness, brotherhood, and human freedom. Her men by the hundreds of thousands have gone to France and are there assisting to the limit of their power in the cause of her allies, and she was ready to furnish still larger forces for the achievement of victory.

Another and a more recent illustration of a movement in the same direction is that of Russia. She too decided to depose her time-honored monarch and become a democratic nation. This step was taken as one of the immediate results of the war. The Czar was dethroned amid scenes of riot and bloodshed, and almost immediately the greater part of the Russian Empire was thrown into disorder and anarchy reigned from Vladivostok to the North Sea. Russia withdrew from the war as a positive force in aid of the cause of the Allies and became an ally of the Central Powers. Foreign trade was paralyzed throughout the land. The lives of foreigners were im-

perilled and their property destroyed; no life was secure; law and order were abandoned and anarchy ruled. Russia became not only no help to the Allies but became a menace to the world.

One cannot examine these two illustrations of recent events in the national life of two countries which comprise together fully one-third of the world's total population, without raising the question as to what has made the difference between these two great nations, moving from an absolute monarchy to a democracy in the same general period. We at first might say that it was due largely to the religious and fundamental ideals of the two nations. We must remember, however, that China has always been classed as a pagan nation. Her people are largely Confucianists, Buddhists, and Taoists. These religions inculcate gentleness of action and friendliness of spirit. At the same time we must remember that Russia was a Christian country, controlled by a national Christian Church conspicuous among the churches of the world, with magnificent cathedrals and a great, far-reaching, powerful church organization. It is impossible to find in these two religious principles the reason why the fundamental change was made, in one instance in quietness and peace and in the other in riots and disorder.

If we go back for a century and look into the history of these two countries, we find that Christian missionaries entered China at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The Bible was translated into the languages of the people; Christian institutions were established; schools were opened and Western learning was introduced, until gradually Western educational institutions, from the kindergarten to the college and university, stretched across China from south to north and from the east to the most remote province of the west. Chinese young men of the most daring spirit and of the broadest intellect soon

found their way to the West and took extensive courses of study in the best institutions of America and England. Preceding the adoption of the constitution by China, she adopted the system of Western learning which had been introduced into her borders by the missionaries. It became the education of the Government. Through this Western learning, in which constitutional government and modern history as well as the principles of Christianity were systematically and thoroughly taught, China saw a new light. Then when she began to long for a larger liberty in the making of her own laws and the administration of her own affairs, it was but natural that the country should turn to the young men who had been educated in mission institutions and in colleges and universities in the West, to assume places of leadership. These men had the confidence of the Chinese. The people were ready in a large degree to follow their leadership, and so when word went forth that China was to change her monarchy to a democracy these students of the West and of the constitutional governments of the world were called upon to prepare a constitution which when prepared was accepted, and China became free.

With Russia it was different. While the Bible in Russia was freely printed and freely distributed, there was no liberty given to the people to study constitutional government and modern history. No missionaries were allowed to enter the great Russian Empire and establish modern Christian schools upon the modern Christian basis. Russian students who had studied these great subjects abroad were not allowed to return, and if perchance any did reënter the country, their lives were in peril and in multitudes of cases their liberty was taken from them on the mere supposition that they were supporters of the doctrine of the rights of the people to have a voice in the making and execution of their own laws.

When Russia took the important step towards a democracy she had no leaders of adequate training and of safe ideals. Those who did assume control had been trained in the school of socialism and anarchy, into which the principles of justice and righteousness and brotherhood had not entered.

It does not require a great stretch of the imagination to picture what might have been the result had Russia at the beginning of the eighteenth century permitted American missionaries, men and women of the highest intellectual and spiritual equipment, with lofty ideals taught by the gospel of Christ, to enter her empire and establish there great outstanding modern educational and religious institutions. Then when her hour of crisis came she would have had men and women of moral and intellectual strength and of recognized leadership to lead Russia safely over the bar into the harbor of peace. I do not believe it is presumptuous to say that one of the outstanding differences between these two countries, in the method and results of their throwing off their monarchy and establishing a constitutional, democratic form of government, is due in large part, if not entirely, to the fact that Christian missionaries were given so large opportunity in China to promote those lofty ideals taught by Christ Himself and His disciples and to build them into institutions that have already become a part of China's national, social, and intellectual life, and that if they had had the same privileges in Russia for the same period, the outcome in Russia would have been wholly different from what it is today. Facts of this character are convincing the missionary leaders that the horizon of their vision must be enlarged to include a message to the nations as well as to the individual and to society. Much of the teaching in the New Testament, in the light of present history, not only can be interpreted in terms of the nation but we are rapidly learning that anything

short of such an interpretation is a clear misreading of the purpose and order of God.

VI. WORLD DEMOCRACY AND MISSIONS

The last twelve years have recorded a rapid advance among the nations of the world from an autocratic to a democratic form of government. By democratic form of government we mean a government in which the people have a voice in deciding to what laws they shall be subject, the method by which these shall be executed, and by whom. President Wilson has given to the world the declaration that this war is now being fought to make the world safe for democracy. Twenty years ago but a small proportion of the world's population lived under a democratic form of government. The monarchy was the rule. A hundred years ago democracies were not only the exception but they were looked upon by most of the world as an experiment in government destined to disaster. Today more than twenty nations are joined together in a mighty alliance for the protection of democracy or, in other words, for the protection of the rule and rights of the people as against the divine right of kings.

There have been many instances in history where an autocracy has gone wrong. History is full of the records of kings deposed and their successors installed often by violence, the only remedy the people had for protection against a rule that was unjust and intolerable. This was remotely an expression of the spirit of democracy, but, however that may be, it was a remedy by which an autocrat gone wrong might be prevented from working evil in the world. It was the only recognized and known method of reform for an impossible autocrat. On the other hand, a democracy is the rule of the people. It is the people themselves, the majority under leadership, who decide what form the democracy shall take, who

shall guide it and under what laws. The success of a democracy depends upon the steadiness and intelligence of the people and upon their being actuated and inspired by the right ideals. It is not sufficient that the people shall have ideals. Germany was as thoroughly actuated by ideals as any country on the face of the earth at the outbreak of the war. These ideals had been taught to all her citizens from their youth up and had become a part of their inmost thinking; but the ideals were low, unworthy an intelligent people, and, when carried into action, became a menace to the world. We have found that when an autocracy goes wrong there is a remedy, but when a democracy goes wrong, it becomes a curse to itself and the world. While President Wilson announced that this war is being fought to make the world safe for democracy, undoubtedly if he were to express his thought on the subject at the present time, he would say it was to make democracy safe for itself and for the world.

The entire world is moving with startling rapidity toward a democratic form of government. While Japan maintains a monarchy, nevertheless the people of Japan have a large voice and strong influence in shaping Japan's national life. She has a constitutional government, a parliament elected by the people, and while the Emperor rules in Japan, nevertheless he would indeed be a brave and bold Emperor who would take any step that would run athwart the will and wishes of the people of Japan. In the Japanese press-discussions upon government plans for internal development or affecting relations with the outside nations, one sees nothing as to the opinion of the Emperor upon the subject. Japan has already reached that stage where the voice of the people is heard with authority and where the people's will is becoming the supreme will of the nation.

We have already referred to China where that vast population, having thrown off the rule of the aristocracy,

now come under a government of self-rule and self-determination. No words can be found to describe adequately the significance of China democratized, or what she may become with her resources of men and material wealth developed and her relations to the Far East, touching as she does upon one side the great Russia and the waters that connect Japan with India and, on the other side, bordering upon the Pacific Ocean over against the United States. China's place in world progress is one of portent far beyond the power of any prophet now to foresee.

Coming further west we find India with some 325,000,000 of people who have been for more than half a century controlled in most part by England. Among this number there are 67,000,000 Mohammedans, in some respects the most virile of the country. English rule has been benevolent, aiming at the development of the Indian people and their preparation for a measure of self-government. India's millions watched with profound interest the conflict between Russia and Japan, since they had been brought up to believe that the Asiatic races were naturally subject to the white races of the West. When Russia was defeated, India got a new conception of the possibility of independence for the Asiatic. She began to demand from England a larger measure of self-government and self-expression, which was freely granted. The present war, however, has carried India an enormous stride forward in self-consciousness and in her desire for home rule. She has furnished more than a million men to Great Britain to fight the war of the West for democracy. She was ready to furnish more men; but at the same time she has obtained a new conception of the possibilities that lie before India in the line of self-government. Demands have been made on Great Britain that a larger measure of home rule shall be given India, and these demands are receiving favorable consideration, and India will

soon be making her own laws and choosing those who shall execute them. India, which only fifty years ago seemed nationally helpless and incapable of self-government because of the lack of training and of dissensions among the various races making up her diverse population, is now uniting, the Hindu and the Mohammedan alike demanding that she have a share and a large share in the mighty democratic movement of the age. England has already promised India a large part at least of that for which she is asking.

We will not refer again to Russia, with its 180,000,000 already broken away from its autocratic government and old traditions and feeling its way blindly toward some form of self-government that shall recognize the rights of the people and grant them power of self-expression.

We will not prolong the list, but there are other smaller peoples moving in the same direction and countries that retain their monarch but shorn largely of power to rule because of the insistence of the people themselves upon a larger measure of self-rule. We have here named four countries which possess about two-thirds of the entire population of this world, all of which, within the last decade, have moved with startling rapidity away from an autocratic government into a form of democracy. If the movement of all these peoples is actuated by the proper ideals and the laws that they make are based upon the principles of justice, righteousness, and brotherhood, the world will move on speedily and steadily toward that happy day when nations shall dwell together in unity. But what will be the result to the world if these thousand million of the world's population or any important portion of them should come into a democratic form of government with ideals which will be a menace not only to their own populations but a curse to the rest of the world? Under such conditions we can turn only to the God of nations and devoutly call upon Him to have mercy

upon the world gone wrong and headed for self-destruction. It is fundamentally imperative, therefore, that these nations moving toward democracy should be inspired with ideals which will guarantee safety for themselves, their people, their immediate neighbors, and for the remoter nations that must deal with them in international relations.

What safeguard, therefore, can be thrown about this mighty, almost universal, democratic movement, so as to turn a possible curse into the greatest of blessings? There will always remain the influence which goes out from the Christian method of dealing with Eastern races, but such influences must necessarily be limited. The Christian merchant from the West can exert a strong, helpful influence upon these people of the East, but this influence is hampered by the fact that he goes to the East for personal gain. There are those who claim that education will make these nations safe; that if Japan, China, India, and Russia will only adopt modern education, build up great colleges and universities, put a high premium upon modern scholarship, introduce all the modern sciences, teach history and all that goes with it, this will make these coming Eastern democratic countries safe for the world. There is no denying the fact that a modern education has the greatest value, which cannot be overlooked when we consider those forces that must be brought to bear upon the East in this critical period of their history. At the same time we cannot forget, and must not, that Germany at the outbreak of this great war was called the best-educated nation on the face of the earth. Neither can we escape from the fact that because of her education in every department of science and history, Germany's menace to the world has been vastly greater than it otherwise would have been. Education has not saved Germany from bringing upon the world the greatest war of history accompanied by atro-

cities surpassing those perpetrated by the worst African tribes or the savages of the South Seas, forcing the world to make the greatest sacrifice ever made in any equal period of the world's history. Modern education without those ideals that must lie at the base of a safe and just and righteous government as taught by Jesus and his apostles and handed down through the universal Church from age to age, can never make safe a nation or a democracy.

We come then to the inevitable conclusion that it is only the living Church of Christ, reaching out into these great countries of the East through its multiform missionary agencies and establishing there Christian institutions of every character and grade, that we can implant in the hearts of their leaders who make the laws, shape the government, and establish international relationships, those principles of righteousness which will make them a blessing and not a curse to the world. This is putting upon the Church and the great missionary cause a stupendous and overwhelming responsibility, and yet it is one that they cannot evade. It is a responsibility that never was dreamed of a generation ago, but one that now with all its force thrusts itself to the front. To meet this responsibility the Church at home must rally its forces to the last man and the last woman and its resources to the last dollar that it may fulfil its sacred and world-embracing mission. This conflict is now ended, with the one mighty menace to human liberty crushed, and now the Church must take up its task, greater and more enduring even than the one for which the Allies fought, namely, to make, through the power of the universal gospel committed to it, the emerging democracies of the nations safe for themselves and for the world.

This is the task of the Church revealed to it by this war. The fact that foreign missions are the only agencies through which the Church can influence the ideals, ambi-

tions, thought, and life of the great nations and coming races of Africa and the East for justice, righteousness, and fraternity, removes them from the inferior position in which they have hitherto been classed, and gives them a place among the most important world-shaping agencies. The most potent energy today operating for international fraternity and world peace is the force that acts through modern foreign missions.